

## **Special Issue**

# **A Cross-Case Analysis of Three Social Justice-Oriented Education Programs**

Mariela A. Rodríguez  
*University of Texas at San Antonio*

Terah Venzant Chambers  
*Texas A&M University*

María Luisa González  
*University of Texas at El Paso*

James Joseph Scheurich  
*Texas A&M University*

*This cross-case analysis was based on three main questions that addressed three social justice-oriented education programs. The three questions were: 1) What critical elements underlie programs that prepare professionals for social justice? 2) What can we learn from these programs in support of educational-leadership programs whose aim is to prepare leaders for social justice? and, 3) What types of resistance have these programs perhaps faced in their preparation of leaders and educators for social justice? Each pair of authors analyzed the cases. Then we developed a "meta-consensus table" that combined all three cases for each of the three questions listed above. We then sorted the categories into themes within each meta-consensus table. Each theme was presented within the discussion of each of the three aforementioned questions. This was followed by a general discussion of the results. First, it was evident that program faculty played a key role in program development and implementation. Second, it is vital that social justice serves as the focus for all courses within a preparation program, rather than just select courses. Third, the variety of program structure across the three cases demonstrates the need for continued conversations about the most effective delivery method for individual programs and the students that they serve. Fourth, the importance of student recruitment to the program was an important component that sought to extend the existing social justice orientation of potential program candidates. The last section described resistances that were faced within the three cases. Forms of resistance came from students, faculty, and university administrators. We concluded the cross-case analysis by offering recommendations to overcome the resistances, and to encourage administrator preparation programs to place social justice at the core of student recruitment, program development, and program delivery.*

### *Introduction and Context*

In the prior three articles on three different social justice-oriented education programs at three different institutions, the authors studied a school leadership preparation program, an early childhood program, and a counseling psychology program, all of which had committed to an explicit, central focus for preparing program graduates who would have a strong orientation toward social justice in their work as school leaders. This article, then, is an analysis of these three cases studies, i. e., a cross case analysis. However, we will first start with an explanation of the context for all of this work.

At the beginning of the Hernandez and McKenzie case, they discuss an article that appeared in *Educational Administration Quarterly* (McKenzie, et al., 2008) that was titled, "A proposal for educating [school] leaders for social justice." This article, though, has a history that led up to that article and then led to the preparation of the three cases and this cross case analysis, and knowing some of that history will be helpful to understanding why we did these case studies and the cross case analysis.

The Educational Leadership Department at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio (not Miami University in Florida) over several summers invited scholars from other universities to review the Miami leadership program and have discussions with Miami faculty and students on the strengths and challenges of the Miami program and more generally on the strengths and challenges of educational leadership

with a special focus on social justice issues, which have been central to the Miami program for many years. Since the Miami program has this strong social justice orientation, those who were invited from the outside also tended to have the same orientation. While other efforts may have evolved out of these summer gatherings, during the event for June 22-23, 2004, one Miami scholar—Michael Dantley—and three outside scholars—Colleen Capper (University of Wisconsin-Madison), Kathryn McKenzie (Texas A&M University), and James Joseph "Jim" Scheurich (Texas A&M University)—got involved in an intense conversation about social justice-oriented school leaders and school leaders who were being successful in terms of achievement (based on state accountability systems) in schools populated primarily by students of color, students with disabilities, and students from low-income homes. They argued as to whether social justice orientation and achievement success were opposed, overlapping, or the same. In the end, they generally agreed that both were possible and both were critically needed.

The conversation, though, did not stop there. They concluded that the field of educational leadership scholars was not placing sufficient public emphasis on the importance of the combination of a social justice orientation and achievement success. In addition, they concluded that the field was not paying enough attention to doing research on schools that were both led by social justice-oriented leaders and accomplished at

significantly improving achievement scores and reducing achievement differences among various student groups. They vowed to try to pull a group of social justice-oriented educational leadership scholars together to address these issues.

The four of them contacted some other social justice scholars who were interested in the same issues. One of the ones they contacted, Maria Louisa Gonzalez, came up with some funds to pull a group together at Mexico State University at Las Cruces, New Mexico, during the next year. Those who came to that two-day gathering were Colleen Capper, María Luisa González, Dana Christman, Elsy Fierro, Michael Dantley, Kathryn Bell McKenzie, Nelda Cambron-McCabe, and Jim Scheurich. What occurred at this meeting was a wide-ranging discussion of social justice, achievement, successful school leaders, and leadership preparation programs. At the end, though, what the group felt was the most important first step was to compose an article about how to develop a leadership preparation program that was focused both on social justice and on achievement success. Most of the group then later met again at a gay friendly bed and breakfast, called "The Painted Lady," in San Antonio where they began to put together the article, which came out in 2008 in the *Educational Administration Quarterly* and which Hernandez and Bell-McKenzie describe and summarize in their case study in this special issue.

After that article came out, the group met at the UCEA (University Council for Educational Administration)

conference to decide next steps. By this time Elsy Fierro had gone on to different work, Frank Hernandez joined the group, and María Luisa González had moved to the University of Texas at El Paso. The next step they decided was to develop some case studies of education programs that had made social justice a central feature of their programs. This special issue, then, is the result of that decision. There are three cases studies, and this is the cross case analyses of those three cases.

### *Our Methodology for the Cross Case Analysis*

The four of us doing the cross case analysis divided ourselves into three pairs, María Luisa and Mariela, Mariela and Terah, and Terah and Jim. Each pair read one case individually and then individually identified answers to three questions: 1) What critical elements underlie programs that prepare professionals for social justice? 2) What can we learn from these programs in support of educational-leadership programs whose aim is to prepare leaders for social justice? and, 3) What types of resistance have these programs perhaps faced in their preparation of leaders and educators for social justice? Each individual within a pair then combined in a table all of the answers to these three questions and weighted each answer as to its perceived importance on a 1 through 3 scale. Next, each pair went through their two lists together, combining similar answers and averaging weighting of importance. The result was a "consensus" table for each case with categories of answers to each question.

Our second step was to build a new chart which combined the consensus table each pair had developed with the consensus table the other two pairs had developed. Consequently, we then had, what might be called, a "meta-consensus table" that combined all three cases for each of the three questions listed above. We then thematized the categories within each meta-consensus table. For example, under the theme "Faculty," we included the categories of "faculty hired with social justice orientation," "explicit recruiting of diverse faculty," and "annual retreat for faculty," along with five other categories from the three cases. Under the theme, "Curriculum," we included the categories, "Students have input into curriculum," "Critical reflection within all coursework," and "Students encouraged to seek multiple perspectives, including external courses," along with four other categories from the three cases, and so on. Thus, a chart was created for the answers to each of the three questions, and within each chart, themes were developed. Using these charts, then, we wrote our cross case analysis for each question. We now turn to our cross case analysis that addresses our three questions as applied to the three cases.

***Cross Case Comparisons: What Critical Elements Underlie Programs that Prepare Professional for Social Justice?***

Six themes emerged from the three cases—an Early Childhood program, a Leadership program, and a Counseling program—to address the question of what were the perceived critical elements underlying each

program that was explicitly preparing school leaders and other educators to enact social justice in the means and ends of their work in schools. These themes were a) faculty, b) curriculum, c) program structure, d) program and student review and evaluation, e) student recruitment and selection, f) student support, and g) external relationships, with the first three having the greatest number of categories.

**Faculty.** Under "faculty" theme, there was only one category that was identified in more than one program, and this was a focus on diverse faculty, which was a component of both the early childhood and counseling program cases. The rest of the categories under the "faculty" theme were only identified in one program. In the early childhood case, there was a focus on faculty being hired with a social justice orientation, open dialogue among faculty within the program, faculty research and publications focused on social justice, and regular faculty meetings. In the leadership program case, there was attention to professional development and socialization of faculty. In the counseling program case, there was a concentration on a faculty annual retreat and a half day annual retreat for faculty to attend to issues of multiculturalism, which in some disciplines has a meaning similar to social justice in educational leadership (McCray, Wright, and Beachum, 2004; Sleeter, 2001).

Another way to understand these categories, taken holistically, is to divide them into three areas. First, those in these three programs attended to hiring

based on a social justice orientation and on the diversity of the faculty. Second, there was a concentration on development and growth involving open dialogue, professional development, socialization, retreats, and regular meetings. This leaves a third area with only one category from one program, doing research and publishing with a social justice orientation.

**Curriculum.** Under the theme, "curriculum," there was one category that was found in all three cases, and two that were in two cases. The category that was in all three cases was a result of the purpose of the case study, that all the programs would have a strong social justice orientation. Thus, this category was "program/curriculum infused with diversity and social justice throughout, core commitment to social justice; strong social justice mission and belief system." The two categories that were in two programs were development of a critical consciousness in the early childhood and leadership program cases and critical reflection in all courses, which was in the leadership program and counseling program cases. Of course, some would argue that these two overlap so it could be concluded that all three programs were committed to critical reflection and/or critical consciousness. The remaining curriculum categories were students encouraged to see multiple perspectives, students have input into the curriculum, and students challenged with the diversity of the curriculum. Seen holistically, these three cases recommend social justice throughout all aspects of the curriculum, critical consciousness and critical reflection in

all courses, student exposure to multiple perspectives and challenging diversity, and student input into the program

**Program Structure.** Under the theme of "program structure," there were six categories with none of them being identified with more than one program. The early childhood case included the program being tailored to individual needs, key stakeholder support, and community partnerships, while the leadership program case emphasized trusting cohorts, thus two opposing approaches. The early childhood case also included multiple methods for course delivery, including weekends and online, summer residency, and faculty team teaching. The counseling program case had the category, "Quality internships and practicum arranged with a social justice focus and premium applicability." Taken together, the three programs recommend multiple modes of delivery, team teaching, summer residencies, social justice internships, and practicums, while there was no agreement on cohorts v. individualized paths through the program.

**Student Recruitment and Selection.** Under the "student selection" theme, there were four categories, but none that existed in more than one program. The early childhood program included diversity and a social justice orientation in their selection of students which resulted in around half of their students being students of color, mostly Latina/o students. The leadership program case included a three stage student selection process—1) submission of application materials, 2) a writing assignment, and 3) a personal

interview with program faculty. In the counseling program case, there was an emphasis on a rigorous student application process. However, it could be concluded that the leadership program process was the kind of rigorous process the counseling program also emphasized.

**Student Support.** Under the theme of “student support,” only one program, the counseling program case, had any categories. The first category was that providing fellowships to students was a priority. The second was a travel fund for students to attend conferences. The third was induction support for students after graduation, which was one of the main recommendations that was made in the McKenzie, et al. (2008) article. At a similar small size, the theme, “program and student review and evaluation,” had only two categories. One, faculty evaluating students in terms of social justice, existed in two of the cases. The other was an annual review of the program.

**External Relationships.** The last theme was labeled, “external relationships,” and all of them came from the early childhood case. They included key stakeholder support for the program, community partnerships, relationships with community colleges to help historically marginalized students participate in the program, a successful effort to lobby the state to mandate that universities must accept community college transfer credits, and the development of a multicultural study and research group for both faculty and doctoral students across the state in which the program was located.

Clearly, the early childhood program had a strong focus on relationships outside the university, while neither of the other two did.

**Conclusion.** What stands out in this cross case analyses of the three programs are three meta-themes. First, the three programs appear to recommend a strong, thorough, persistent focus on diversity and social justice in faculty hiring, student selection, and program courses or, better, in all aspects of the program. Second, to some degree the programs emphasized different areas. For example, the early childhood program was outstanding on external relationships, while the counseling program case included a strong focus on student support. Third, there was considerable variety in how social justice oriented programs are done—in terms of faculty issues, curriculum emphases, program structure, etc. In other words, in this analysis, there was not one best model or approach, but there is much to think about and consider for other program faculty who want to design a social justice oriented program or who already have one and want to improve it.

***Cross Case Comparison: What Types of Resistance Have These Programs Perhaps Faced in Their Preparation of Leaders and Educators for Social Justice?***

The following cross-case comparisons are based on the question, what types of resistance have these programs perhaps faced in their preparation of leaders and educators for social justice? Seven programmatic

areas will be discussed in this section. These are: a) program structure, b) student recruitment and selection, c) departmental resistance, d) student resistance, e) interdepartmental resistance, f) university resistance, and g) suggestions to counter resistances.

**Program Structure.** Within the theme of program structure, there were three categories that were identified. In the category that looked at the courses being inherently more difficult to infuse with a social justice orientation, the early childhood education program found this to be true in one case they mentioned. Although all the coursework in this program was infused with social justice, one course dealing with nutrition and health was somewhat more challenging within which to reflect social justice consciousness. In the next category it appeared that the leadership program merged its social justice-oriented program into an existing doctoral program. Sometimes merging programs leaves remnants of the old program that do not coincide with new program objectives. The last category on program structure resistance was faced by the students in the counseling program who claimed that most of their coursework focused only on race and culture, thus, leaving out gender, disability, and sexual orientation. The need, then, to infuse program structure with coursework relevant to student needs is a valuable consideration for all faculty developing social justice-oriented leadership preparation programs.

**Student Recruitment and Selection.** The next theme on student recruitment and selection was divided

into two categories. The early childhood program noted the familiar complaint throughout early childhood education that it was difficult to increase the presence of men in the program. On the other hand, the leadership program explained how expensive the programs were and the lack of financial support for students significantly impacted enrollment. No resistances regarding student recruitment and selection were identified within the counseling program case study.

**Departmental Resistance.** The third theme related to a general look at departmental resistance. There were seven categories that emerged from this general theme. One area noted in the early childhood education program case study related how some faculty resisted using assessment in the area of student dispositions per NCATE accreditation demands. They felt that this type of assessment was not in keeping with the social justice foundation of their program and went against raising critical consciousness. In the same early childhood program, another type of resistance was mentioned whereby some faculty, especially women, felt that they were not taken seriously by state legislators. One interviewee felt that state legislators were patriarchal in thinking that the profession was "made up and headed mostly by women."

Four of the other categories under departmental resistance were identified within the leadership program case study. For instance, it was noted that faculty lacked training and experience with social justice. A possible consequence of this could have impacted the category that dealt with

the fact that there was a lack of buy-in from the entire faculty. Another leadership program case study category noted the struggle that faculty encountered in co-creating courses with students. This could have been due to lack of experience among both faculty and students as co-developing courses is not traditional practice. All of these factors could have contributed to the last category for leadership program under this theme, which was how faculty did not remain committed to social justice program goals. The last two categories under departmental resistance appeared to describe the counseling program. The counseling program faculty was cohesive enough to move beyond a lack of consensus on the definitions of diversity and multiculturalism. However, this discrepancy may have resulted in students viewing the faculty as "divided" regarding what social justice in counseling should be.

**Student Resistance.** The fourth theme was student resistance with three categories. The early childhood education program created a purposeful tension among its students where certain religious groups resisted accepting their homophobia. This type of course activity raised the aspect of personal resistance to help lead students through the developmental phases of becoming critically conscious educators. Student resistance was again encountered by the leadership program but in a different form. Resistance was evident when students were not particularly committed to social justice and when their sole ambition was to obtain a doctorate from the institution.

#### *Interdepartmental Resistance.*

The fifth theme related to interdepartmental resistance. The descriptor could be taken from John Donne's "No man is an island..." to no department is an island where coexistence with other university entities will always be required. In the case of the early childhood education program, resistance from other personnel and faculty came up in faculty meetings. The early childhood faculty insisted that all decisions and policies emanate from a critical consciousness whereas faculty outside their program did not exactly agree with them. Rather, the others thought of the early childhood group as troublemakers. Nonetheless, the faculty considered this role in tune with that of being change agents and holding others to equitable ideals.

**University Resistance.** The sixth theme was on university resistance. Again, this theme points to the critical role that external supports play in the development and success of a social justice program. The leadership program experienced a lack of university support when the university did not accept program recommendations, and consequently the program was merged with another doctoral program in the university. This may be an example of university bureaucracy with an eye on the bottom line (student credit hour production) as the impetus for dissolving a leadership program that was attempting to prepare social justice-oriented school leaders.

**Suggestions to Counter Resistances.** The last theme was the overall suggestions to counter



resistances. In this theme, there were two categories that related to the early childhood education program case study. The early childhood education program took its role of socially just preparation to a broader community beyond coursework and classrooms to statewide politics. For example, when the English-Only Movement threatened the state, one of the early childhood faculty members sent a letter to all the other early childhood programs asking them to resist the movement. Although, this action was not honored by all who received the letter, the fact that this group of faculty had expanded their academic roles to that of “expert” activists is evident in the case study. A recommendation from the case study of this early childhood education program was, thus, that those committed to social justice preparation programs always be open to listening to dissenting voices.

**Conclusion.** This section discussed two meta-themes that reflected the concepts of resistance across the three programs relative to three distinct socially-just preparation programs. Some resistances were based on lack of faculty preparedness to teach within a social justice framework, lack of cooperation between faculty and students regarding program development, and students having their traditional beliefs challenged. The second meta-theme that emerged from the analysis was that of suggestions to counter the aforementioned resistances. It is important for programs developing a social justice focus to be aware of obstacles and possible solutions to those obstacles. Program faculty and students need to understand that the move

toward a socially-just focus is a journey rather than a culmination.

***Cross Case Comparison: What Can We Learn From These Programs in Support of Educational Leadership Programs Whose Aim is to Prepare Leaders for Social Justice?***

The following cross-case comparisons are based on the question, what can we learn from these programs in support of educational-leadership programs whose aim is to prepare leaders for social justice? Four themes will be discussed in this section. These are: a) faculty and professional development, b) student recruitment and retention, c) curriculum, and d) faculty/student collaboration.

***Faculty and Professional Development.*** The early childhood case study presented by Christman discussed the importance of hiring faculty who were social justice-oriented. She explained that it was valuable to have faculty who shared this epistemology as collegial members who would carry out the mission of the program. In addition to having such an orientation, it was also important for the faculty who were hired to be diverse. This was also viewed as an asset because different points of view and experiences shared by faculty members would offer students various experiences. Then, there was also some discussion regarding the significance of constant social-justice dialogue that occurred among the faculty members. In hiring persons with a social-justice orientation who offered diverse points of view, this department created a

culture of critical thinkers whose voices were valued.

The leadership preparation program case study presented by Hernandez and McKenzie reflected the value placed on faculty and professional development. It is evident that without initial and on-going professional learning, faculty in these departments might not feel comfortably prepared to teach social justice content. It was also crucial that faculty participated in training prior to the delivery of the program. Professional development that is offered on a continuous basis gives faculty members time to reflect on what they have learned and to find ways to apply this in their classrooms. Furthermore, given that the early childhood case study found that "faculty will typically face some kind of resistance to what they are doing from some part of parts of the institution," it is important that such faculty be well-prepared to handle this resistance and move forward in completing their mission for socially-just teaching and learning. Faced with similar issues, faculty members in the counseling program learned that they could take something from their lack of consensus about definitions of diversity and social justice. They used this as a reflection stage in their process.

One innovative event that the counseling case study (McKinney & Capper) revealed was the department-sponsored social justice conference. It seemed that this annual event was a way to effectively bring the students, university faculty, and community educators together to discuss social justice issues. This was seen as a

positive approach to showcase the social justice-oriented program.

*Curriculum.* Issues related to curriculum were found to be important to learn from all three social justice programs. Two of the top-ranked issues were found in two of the programs. The first was that the social justice mission was at the core of all program initiatives. In the Christman article, social justice was imbedded in all aspects of the curriculum, horizontally across all courses and vertically from undergraduate through graduate programs. This even extended to the lab school run by the program. Similarly, the founding director from the Hernandez and McKenzie article indicated that critical consciousness was imbedded in each of their courses. Taking this point a step further, students were also asked to write reflections on "their own assumptions and the evolution of their own readings and dialogues with cohort and community members" (p. 13).

Another important element found in two of the programs was the need to address the spectrum of "isms" throughout the curriculum. In the Hernandez and McKenzie article, the program was noted as addressing issues of racism, classism, sexism, ableism, and heterosexism in all of their courses. The McKinney and Capper article similarly addressed multiple facets of diversity, covering content in all courses, but requiring a multicultural education class that specifically addressed issues of religion/spirituality, ability/disability, gender, sexual orientation, social class, and race and ethnicity (including white privilege).

*Student Recruitment and Selection.* The early childhood case study revealed that it was important that diverse students were selected to the program and that these students demonstrated social justice in their current practice. This showed the importance of selecting the best candidates who would not only benefit from participation in the program, but who would be able to make significant contributions to faculty and other students. Therefore, the composition of the student cohort in this program was carefully screened and selected for maximum impact.

Conversely, it was clear that the majority of students in the leadership preparation program self-selected for participation. While this type of practice gives more opportunities for more students to participate, it is difficult to assess the level of social justice orientation and experiences that these prospective students will bring to the program (McKenzie et al., 2008). Another related concept was that no scholarships or fellowships were offered to students who applied to this leadership preparation program. Such a lack of funding opportunities could cause students who might be a great "fit" for the program to reconsider applying.

The counseling case study presented informative demographics regarding student participation. What was most revealing was the fact that 28% of the students enrolled in this program were students of color, compared with an institutional graduate enrollment of only 9% for students of color. Also, the department reported

that they received about 100 applications to their doctoral program each year, of which approximately eight were accepted. This could stem from aggressive recruiting strategies of the university. For example, there is currently a partnership with another institution's outstanding undergraduates. The counseling faculty recruited this pool of excellent applicants into their graduate program. Such unique partnerships are one way to ensure a pipeline of exemplary undergraduates who could be successful as graduate students in a social justice-oriented counseling program.

An important consideration regarding curriculum voiced in the Christman article was that building a program around social justice is a "journey and no program ever quite 'gets there.'" (p. 15). Programs addressing issues of diversity and social justice will likely encounter many bumps in their journey, but these are not necessarily indicators of weakness or failure. This article also discussed the importance of flexibility in course delivery. Students have core classes they are required to take, but can also tailor their various electives to their specific interests. The last issue related to curriculum, also mentioned in the Christman article, included tailoring the program to local needs. Program faculty actually viewed their program as an extension of the larger community itself. In this way, looking to ensure their program reflected the local community and addressed its specific needs was seen as natural.

*Faculty/Student Collaboration.*

Collaboration among the faculty and students was another aspect of these social justice programs from which we can learn. In the program discussed in the Hernandez and McKenzie article, faculty and students worked collaboratively to co-create one-third of the content of each course. This brought its own set of challenges, including the fact that sometimes the students' interests shifted very narrowly to specific topics and not to a broad range of diversity and social justice issues deemed important by the program. Nonetheless, this innovative strategy served to ensure students were actively encouraged in contributing to their own learning.

*Conclusion.* This section presented four meta-themes that were reflected across the three programs to inform us about what we can learn from these successful programs in support of educational leadership programs whose aim is to prepare leaders for social justice. First, the value of faculty preparation and student selection are key components for program success. It is crucial that faculty be well-prepared to teach social justice material, and for them to feel comfortable with the course content. Second, the value of selecting diverse students who demonstrated social justice in their professional experiences seemed to be a model for other programs to follow. In this manner, these students could extend the work they had already accomplished, and share their experiences in class sessions. Third, it was evident that a social justice mission needed to be at the core of program decision-making, and

that tailoring the program to meet student needs was significant. In this manner, the program could differentiate content based on student strengths and previous experiences. Building on what students already know can only heighten the effects of a socially-just curriculum so that students can take what they have learned in these programs and apply them to their school settings, thus, making a positive impact on children.

*Discussion*

Returning to the context described at the beginning of this article, a group of social justice-oriented educational leadership faculty developed and published an article describing our "ideal" social justice leadership program (McKenzie, et al., 2008). After this, the same group, with some changes in personnel, decided to publish case studies and a cross case analysis of three current education programs that had been formed around a strong commitment to social justice. Our specific goal in studying the three cases was to address three questions: 1) What critical elements underlie programs that prepare professionals for social justice? 2) What can we learn from these programs in support of educational-leadership programs whose aim is to prepare leaders for social justice? and, 3) What types of resistance have these programs perhaps faced in their preparation of leaders and educators for social justice? Our more general goal was to have our study of the three cases and our cross case analysis be helpful to leadership faculty who might be contemplating creating a

social justice oriented program or making their current program more strongly oriented toward social justice. Thus, the question then becomes what advice might we offer to those working on either of these two possibilities.

First, in terms of faculty, it appears that who the faculty members are is of considerable importance. If the faculty can agree on having a strong social justice orientation and on the meaning of that orientation or if the faculty can be hired for this orientation, there will be much less difficulty internally (though not necessarily externally within the college or university). A second issue related to faculty was that from the outset the faculty ought to plan and sustain an ongoing professional development and dialogue about social justice, the program, the program's students, and the external context. This approach has the potential result of creating a greater consensus among the faculty, more internal strength to handle resistances, more ability to sustain the social justice orientation of the program, and the strength and intent to constantly improve the program.

Second, in terms of curriculum, the primary recommendation would be to infuse social justice at the center of all courses and activities with the recognition that this might be easier in some courses than in others. However, this broad infusion does not obviate the possible need to directly address social justice in one or more courses. Another primary curriculum recommendation would be that social justice is not just race or gender or any single issue; it is both each issue addressed separately,

i.e., it is frequently important just to focus on race and racism, and all issues addressed as interacting, i.e., it is also frequently important to focus on the interaction of race, gender, sexual identity, and social economic status (SES), to name but one possible interaction. A third primary recommendation would be to consciously develop how, throughout the program, each student will develop her or his own critical consciousness/reflexivity. An additional recommendation from one program was to involve students in program design. A final point in this area, also arising from only one of the studied programs, would be for the program faculty to persistently inquire as to how their program connects to their larger context, including the districts, cities, towns, rural areas, etc. in which their graduates may work. Thus, this one program raised the social justice issue of how does the program connect to those it ultimately serves.

Third, in terms of program structure, there was more variety than consensus. Should the program be customized to the individual or cohort-based? Should some or all courses be team taught? Should programs be delivered face-to-face, online, hybrids, etc.? What is the appropriate use of summer residencies, internships, practicum's, etc.? Also, is it better to create a social justice program from scratch or develop it in terms of an existing program? We would likely recommend the former, but the latter may be the only realistic choice.

Fourth, in terms of student recruitment and selection, one primary

consideration would be whether to recruit students who already have a social justice orientation, which one of the programs did. A corollary to this might be to strongly recruit a high percentage of students of color who arguably will more often likely have a social justice orientation as part of their own lives. We know others might argue that it is a better social justice orientation to be open to everyone and then expose them to social justice issues. However, in the McKenzie, et al. (2008) article, the argument was made that most principalship programs are only two years long and that this is too short of a time to start from the beginning (let alone starting with those who have prejudiced attitudes of which most of us have seen many in our programs) to help someone understand a social justice orientation. Still, this is a critical issue that each program will have to decide for itself. A second recommendation, in addition to its connection to the prior point, is to recruit preparation program students representative of those whom schools have not been very successful with, i.e., students of color, LGBT students, students with disabilities, students whose home language and cultures is different than that of the mainstream, students who came from low SES homes, and so on. These students cannot only bring their personal experiences to the course discussions, but also provide a rich interactive environment for learning for everyone, students and professors. A third recommendation was to have a rigorous student selection process, a point that was made in the recent study (Davis,

Darling-Hammond, La Pointe, & Meyerson, 2005) of highly successful leadership programs.

While there were many "smaller" recommendations that emerged from each program, the final major area we will discuss was resistance. The main lesson from our case studies seems to be that resistance, from somewhere, will happen. To do social justice programs within universities and a society that is only sometimes focused on social justice and often focused on creating and sustaining injustice and inequity will almost always be a challenge. This resistance may arise within the program when some faculty do not support a social justice orientation or when there is disagreement as to the meaning of social justice and the ways to shape a social justice oriented program. The resistance may arise from faculty or administrators within the college. These folks may disagree with the social justice orientation or feel challenged by it. They may try to undermine or even eliminate the program. Similarly, there may be resistance at the top of the university or college. They, too, may try to undermine or eliminate the program. There may be resistance within one's field; for example, some within university educational leadership programs are highly critical of social justice as a program focus or orientation.

In addition, there will often be student resistance, particularly if the students are not selected based on a social justice orientation. This student resistance may be active or passive. On the active side, some students will outspokenly resist a social justice

perspective and sometimes even try to garner resistance among a group of students. On the passive side, some students may simply not care; they just want the degree to further their career, but do not actively resist. Finally, there may be resistance at the state or federal level, within schools and districts, by parent or other stakeholder groups, and by foundations that often provide external funding. As the three cases and as our own experiences show, all of these kinds of resistance occur regularly.

The issue, then, is how to create, build, and sustain social justice programs in face of potential resistance from many angles, levels, and spaces. One recommendation would be to build strong solidarity within the program so it is not easy for the resistances to tear the program apart and divide the faculty and students. Another related recommendation is to constantly be working on strengthening the community within the program. A third recommendation would be to choose your battles carefully and not to just fight everyone all of the time. Not only will the latter wear people out, the program will likely lose over time. A fourth recommendation would be to carefully choose the language you use in relation to those who are resistant. There is language that divides and language that provides people the opportunity to work together. Unfortunately, sometimes those of us with a social justice orientation seem more interested in a kind self-centered flaming in defense of our perspective than in working and using words in such a way as to engage others in productive dialogue, even if we end up

disagreeing. A final recommendation would be to find and develop allies. Our experience is that there will be others in the college, the institution, the field, schools and districts, and parents and neighborhoods that support social justice goals. These allies can be of help in many ways at different points. In the end, just as it is true that there are schools that create conditions of caring and success for all students, there are education programs that develop and sustain social justice as a central orientation.

### *Conclusion*

Developing social justice university programs in a country of great inequity and injustice is difficult. We only have to look at who is in our prisons (predominantly men of color), who are the poor (predominantly women, children, and folks of color), who are predominantly at the bottom of the economic hierarchy (women, children, and folks of color), who have the worst paying jobs, who cleans the hotel rooms and who stays in them, who gets bullied the most (girls, feminine boys, and LGBT students), who commits suicide at a higher rate (LGBT students), whose school achievement is the lowest (students from low income homes and students of color), who lives within the worst housing and gets the worst health care (low income families and families of color) and on and on to see the inequity and injustice. It is rife within our society and rife within our educational systems, pre-kindergarten through our doctoral programs. It is easy to see, then, why many of us attempt to

develop programs that prepare leaders and other educators to broaden social justice in a democracy whose rhetoric commits itself to social justice and equity for everyone.

Despite the barriers and despite the resistances, an increasing number of university education programs have either integrated social justice within their programs or formed programs build on social justice as a primary foundation. The three case studies

presented here provide examples of those who have chosen to take this journey. In addition, this cross case analysis attempts to illustrate what those programs have done and how we can use their experiences to guide the rest of us in this civil rights journey that started with the founding of this nation. We truly hope that our work here is helpful to others in carrying forward this hallowed journey.

### References

- Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., La Pointe, M., & Meyerson, D. (2005). *School leadership study: Developing successful principals* (Review of Research). Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.
- McKenzie, K. B., Christman, D. E., Hernandez, F., Fierro, E., Capper, C. A., Dantley, M., González, M. L., Cambron-McCabe, N., & Scheurich, J. J. (2008). From the field: A proposal for educating leaders for social justice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(1), 111-138.
- McCray, C. R., Wright, J. V., & Beachum, F. D. (2004). An analysis of secondary school principals' perceptions of multicultural education. *Education*, 125(1), 111-120.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(2), 94-106.